DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 012 JC 930 378

AUTHOR Stevenson, Joseph M.
TITLE Systemic Leadership Strategies for Community Colleges Initiating Partnerships with Corporations and Schools.
PUB DATE Jul 93
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at "Leadership 2000," the Annual International Conference of the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program (5th, Washington, DC, July 18-21, 1993).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Planning; *College School Cooperation; Community Colleges; *Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); Institutional Cooperation; Leadership Qualities; Literature Reviews; *Partnerships in Education; *School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; *Shared Resources and Services; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Advocating community college collaboration with corporations and secondary schools, this report reviews methodologies for undertaking "systemic leadership initiatives," or approaches to sharing resources based on collaborative networking. Following an overview of intersector partnerships, section II presents quotations from educational and management literature describing the concepts of leadership, team leadership, partnerships, and collaborative management. Section III, presents additional quotations to argue for the role of systemic leadership partnerships in the reform, revitalization, and renewal of community development in terms of education, the economy, and the environment. This section also discusses resistance to collaborative partnerships on the part of both educators and industry; the role of the systemic leader in bridging the gap between institutional resources and corporate/community needs; and provides brief descriptions of 15 existing partnerships between corporations and educational institutions. Section IV describes prototype initiatives for program delivery between elementary educational institutions and colleges/universities, including five faculty-centered initiatives, four student-centered initiatives, and four business and technology based initiatives. A discussion of systemic planning and autonomy is also included. The final section outlines elemental changes in the transition from traditional management/leadership approaches to systemic leadership initiatives. (PAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 361 012

Systemic Leadership Strategies for Community Colleges Initiating Partnerships with Corporations and Schools

by

Joseph M. Stevenson, PhD
Superintendent of Schools (Acting)
Pleasantville Public Schools
Pleasantville, New Jersey 08232-3198
609-383-6810
609-383-6840

JC 930 378

The 1993 Leadership 2000 National Conference
The League for Innovation in the Community Colleges
Washington, D.C.

A body is not a single organ, but many.
If one organ suffers, all suffer together. If one flourishes, then all rejoice together.
-Corinthians, New English Bible

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. M. Stevenson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

July, 1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Section I Purpose and Overview

Welcome colleagues to this prestigious "Leadership 2000" Conference in Washington. As a graduate of the 1988 League of Innovation Leadership Institute, I am excited about returning to the League to discuss school-collaboration with corporations and schools. I would like to begin my overview today by reading the following statistical data to you concerning education, the economy, and the environment.

> **"By 1999 our urban population will reach 250 million; urban wealth will increase fourfold, and the average family income will be much higher, even in today's purchasing power. To build for that growth, 3,500 billion must be found; 1,500 billion for new housing; 1,000 billion for streets, highways, mass transportation, parking, hospitals, schools and colleges, sewers and sewage disposal and water supply; 1,000 billion for commercial, industrial and utilities construction."**

This quote was made in Newsweek nearly 25 years ago and was cited by Featherstone with Michigan State University (1968) in his essay on future relationships between urban schools and higher education. This reference had implications for educational, economic and environmental development then in the 1960s; and it continues to have implications now in the 1990s. These type of implications drive our needs as educators to be effective systemic leaders.

I was very pleased to recently receive an invitation from Dr. Terry O'Banion with the League for Innovation, to provide this concept paper on systemic partnerships between schools and community colleges. You will note that much of what I am advocating is modeled after the partnership initiative between the Pueblo Public School District and the University of Southern Colorado. I urge you to also view "The High School/Community College Connection" produced by Dale Purnell several years ago.

Let me begin by stating that some of my remarks are excerpted from the other following documents that are available upon request:

On Future Partnerships:

"Future University and Corporate-Business-Industry (CBI) Relations: Challenges for Institutional Advancement In the 1990's and Beyond" (Middle Tennessee State University, 1988)

On Teacher Education:

"Bridging Computer Technology and Cultural Literacy for the Future: New Direction Planning for Teacher Education at Stockton State College (1991) (See also Transformations Vol. 3, No. 2, Spring, 1991)

On Educational Collaboration:

"Toward Systematic Educational Restructuring: Preparing Today's Children for Tomorrow's Needs" (Chancellor's Office, Department of Higher Education, 1992)

On Children At-Risk.

"Public Policy in New Jersey: A Forum on Educational Issues in the 21st Century: Children At-Risk" (South Jersey Public Affairs Center/WTTH 96.1 FM Radio)

In all of these above manuscripts you will find a constant advocacy for building intersector partnerships, promoting educational collaboration, initiating campus-community linkages converging with systemic reform, and developing a vision for the next century based on community-wide reform, renewal and revitalization.

However, the purpose of this concept paper is to take a different approach, and review certain methodologies for moving forward with intra-institutional resource sharing initiatives through collaborative networking--or as I prefer to call "systemic leadership initiatives." I will begin by identifying recent comments on leadership and partnerships, then close with some examples of prototype initiatives and visionary paradigms. You will note that there is particular focus on "teaming", "collaboration", "interdependence", "interconnectness", "alliance," "community" and "cohesiveness". These contemporary terms not only describe future management paradigms; they also provide the constructs for community college educators preparing for the complexities of the next century.

After reading this paper, I hope I have convinced community college leaders to first design the mechanism for connecting educational communities through systemic leadership development before going forward with a strategic vision---focusing on the means versus the ends of educational resource sharing and collaborative partnerships. This document is subsumed with academic citations to references for future research. I am also available to answer any future questions. Please feel free to contact me by calling (609) 383-6810 or 383-6840.

Section II. Systemic Leadership and Team Collaboration: Beyond the Educational Enterprise

MacGregor Burns once noted that leadership is "the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth". In the widely recognized Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership, Bass (1981) identifies that there are over 100 definitions of leadership. Moreover, as Phelps (1991) of Colorado-based Executive Development Associates states, "leadership is not an easy concept to understand...each of us has our own ideas about its meaning." Among the requirements for future leadership effectiveness, Phelps identifies "multiple skills and structures (such as effective teams) to adapt to changing situations".

In attempting to define leadership and collaborative management, several theorists and practitioners have made both similar and divergent assessments. Gardner (1990) in his popular book, On Leadership uses the term "community" to connect the two. He writes, "a good community nurtures its members and fosters an atmosphere of trust...members deal with one another humanely, respect one another, and value the integrity of each person. They both protect and give a measure of autonomy to the individual. Everyone is included...the healthy community encourages individual involvement in the pursuit of shared purpose." Gardner (1989) advocated earlier in Kettering Review that "in vital communities cooperation, compromise, and consensus building will be widely shared pursuits." Senge (1990) of MIT, in The Fifth Discipline warns, "alignment is the necessary condition before empowerment the individual will empower the whole team. Empowering the individual when there is relatively low level of alignment worsens the chaos and makes managing the team even more difficult." Both Senge and Argyris of Harvard University cite the historical difficulties with "management teams." Argyris (1991) in Overcoming Organizational Defenses writes, "the team may function quite well with routine issues. But when they confront complex issues that may be embarrassing or threatening, the "teamness" seems to go to pot." Senge also states, "all too often, teams in business tend to spend their time fighting for turf, avoiding anything that will make them look bad personally, and pretending that everyone is behind the team's collective strategy--maintaining the appearance of a cohesive team."

This dilemma of team vulnerability offers the concept of "systemic leadership development" certain challenges perhaps unique to the educational enterprise--since the very nature of collaboration and teaming is very significant to contemporary program design, delivery and success.

Other theorists have addressed team leadership as well. Bennis (1989) of the University of Southern California, in Why Leaders Can't Lead writes, "where there is leadership, there is a team, a family, a unity. Even people who do not especially like each other feel the sense of community." Nanus (1989) also with the University of Southern California, in The Leader's Edge suggests that "futures-creative leadership demands the willing and enthusiastic cooperation of people and other organizations in joint efforts to create something new and better...The Leader must be able to inspire others to share ideas, trust, and commitment; to communicate well and frequently; to seek collaborative solutions to problems, that will permit the organization to grow, change, and constantly improve." On the concept of "people working together", Sashkin (1988) of Bryn Mawr, in Charismatic Leadership writes, "perhaps it is obvious that only through people can any vision be enacted and thus become real...Nonetheless, many elegant visions fail to provide roles for people, ways to involve people and give them responsibility, and methods for effectively coordinating and integrating their activities based on involvement, rather than on structure or rules." Kouzes and Posner (1988) of Santa Clara University in the Leadership Challenge, suggested that "fostering collaboration begins with creating and sustaining cooperative goals. The best incentive for someone to help you is to know that you will reciprocate this action and help them in return...Cooperation breeds teamwork as solutions are sought to integrate people's needs...the process of building and enhancing power is facilitated when people work on tasks that are critical to the organization's success...and when they are well connected to other people of influence and support." In the Secrets of Effective Leadership, Manske (1982) advocates that, "the effective leader builds group cohesiveness and pride...successful teamwork is exciting."

Finally, Brown and Weiner (1984) in Supermanaging, refers to the process of ***interconnectness*** which should be the basis for systemic leadership development in urban districts. They write, "it is important for managers to understand that awareness of the interconnectedness of all things, of the fragility of the structure of nature, and of the fact that we live in an environment that does have real limits has a substantial and growing effort on the values and behavior."

With all these suggestions of the attributes for team collaboration and leadership, there would be little difficulty designing and developing "systemic leadership" program deliveries; despite the pitfalls identified earlier by Argyris and Senge. Perhaps what needs to first occur is the "tearing down of organizational walls" as suggested by Kanter (1993) of Harvard University. She emphasizes in The School Administrator, of the need for "cross department" teamwork. She adds, "professionals need to remain adapt at their specialties, but

they also should collaborate to solve problems or manage change projects that cannot be contained within just one area." This is particularly paramount for today's K-12, corporate, governmental and higher education sectors.

Section III — Systemic College Partnerships: The Magnet for Corporate-Business-Industry Alliances

In a thought provoking article entitled "Joining Forces: Business and Education Take on Competitiveness" Galagan, (1988) in Training & Development Journal, observed that "when biz wiz H. Ross Perot leads school reform in Texas; when Minnesota Business Partnership asks the governor for sweeping changes in schools; when (former) Xerox chairman David Kearns calls public education the major barrier to U.S. productivity, it is clear that business is getting more aggressive about its role in public education." Galagan adds, "Business and education have been involved for decades, but as in any long relationship, the dynamics change. One of the partners--business--is going through something like a mid-life crisis in its struggles with declining U.S. competitiveness...Many business-education hookups go under the name of "partnerships" and have been more neighborly than challenging."

Lusterman (1977) in Education & Industry, once noted that "industry...is no less a segment of the nation's educational system than our colleges and universities, technical institutes, and other schools." However, as corporate entities continue to construct their own "educational segments" within the institution, the need for systemic leaders to meet new collaborative challenges between their institution and CBI constituencies, becomes more pronounced as both sectors prepare for the 21st century. Fiske (1985) of the New York Times, recently warned that "educational programs run by business and industry have become a 'booming industry' that now constitutes an alternative, if not a threat to traditional colleges and universities."

No doubt, systemic leadership partnerships are necessary for the reform, revitalization and renewal of community development--educationally, economically and environmentally. Perhaps some variables to ponder are as follows relative to employment and educational training, resource allocation, labor trends, technology, and mutual productivity.

Morse (1984) in Employee Educational Programs: Implications for Industry & Higher Education, offers the following reasons why broad collaboration on corporate/employee education has not happened:

1. "Educators argue that corporate training activities are not "educational" in the traditional sense. They do not offer academically grounded material and should be considered only as training, not as education. That is, programs offered by industry are linear and company-specific, and they are not cumulative learning experiences.

2. Industry argues that traditional educational institutions are not responsive to industry's needs and have not recognized that concerns of firms and employees, that educators are not willing to adjust their structure to the interests and schedules of working students."

Nash and Hawthorne (1987) in Formal Recognizing Employee-Sponsored Instruction, state that the "the ultimate extension of corporate educations is a degree-granting college. Generally, corporations have not taken that step, leaving credit and degree-granting authority to existing colleges and universities. In some institutions or "corporate college". These corporate college initiatives will add another paramount dimension to the contemporary scope of systemic leadership. It could be argued that they are the result of limited articulation of shared resources in the past between college-corporate-community sectors.

Murphy (1986) in Handbook of Institutional Advancement, whose corporate support research initiative contacted over one thousand of American's largest corporations, found that "corporations look for cost efficiency, local service delivery and the ability to fill an unmet need." He concluded that (Withers, 1986) "90 percent of responding companies rated potential benefits to the employees as very important in determining the amount of charitable contributions." Withers (1986) in the Handbook, similarly adds that "more and more nonprofit organizations are seeking corporate support in trying to make up the amount that has been trimmed from the federal government social-spending budget in recent years...Because accountability seems to be an important emphasis, it becomes incumbent upon the nonprofit sector to seek out relationships that capitalize on this enlightened self-interest." He concludes, "as one corporate chair put it, if you are not supporting higher education, you are not minding your business." Broce (1979) has according to Withers (1986) noted that "these considerations include direct benefit to the business, improvement of the local areas, improvement of society, public relations, personnel recruitment, and preservation of the free private enterprise system...there are also many business people who just plain care and are attracted to worthy causes." Herein lies implications for environmental development.

In the 1990s and beyond, systemic leaders will be in a unique position to establish new program deliveries and other initiatives to satisfy the emerging needs of corporate constituencies through cooperative ventures, alliances, and partnerships with business and industry.

The future will require both education and corporations to be more "interdependent" and less independent despite the compelling forces of academic territorialism within the traditional academy and the free enterprise nature of corporate America. The future systemic leader will be, in addition to traditional responsibilities, charged with bridging the gap between institutional resources and corporate/community needs. However, as Fidler (1982) in New Directions for Community College, observes, "before the gap between business needs and institutional resources can be bridged, educators will need to learn more about business operations and the impact of a trained labor force on economic development in the college region." Responding to "labor force" economic development is just one among numerous initiatives higher education must challenge in the 1990s and beyond--particularly in preparation for "Workforce 2000" and racial, gender and intellectual diversity.

Ferrari (1984) in the National Study of Cooperation Between Higher Education & Industry, reported in his study several years ago that many postsecondary institutions had a strong interest in strengthening their relationships with CBI sectors. Johnson (1984) citing Ferrari writes, "at most of the institutions in one survey, the presidents did not give very high marks to their present cooperative arrangements with industry, but they did rate the potential for increased cooperation during the 1980s as very high. Moreover, this positive interest was evident at all types of institutions in all parts of the country." Jaschik (1986) of the Chronicle of Higher Education, similarly reported that both two-year and four year institutions were directing academic programs and services not only to student clientele but business-industry clientele as well. Likewise, Gould (1988) of the Chronicle reported that "more and more colleges and universities are turning to the business community for advice on a number of issues, including even the most sacred of academic artifacts, the curriculum." Honicky (1985) of AT&T in AGB Reports added that "the subject of corporate efforts between higher education and the business world is suddenly quite fashionable." Sculley (1988) of Apple Computer, Inc. in the Educom Bulletin, later stated that "we are privileged to live during a extraordinary time...It is the turning of an era...The world is in passage from the industrial age to the information age. This a time of profound changes, in which the key economic resources in the world will no longer be capital, labor and raw materials, but rather knowledge, individual innovators, and information. Technologies emerging today will give us the ability to explore, convey, and create knowledge as never before...This has enormous

implications for us as individuals, as well as for our institutions...Our colleges and universities will take on especially heavy responsibilities as we make this transition." The Northeast-Midwest Institute (1988) stated in Education Incorporated, that "the search for better corporative relationships has become a dominant theme in contemporary university management...Sputtering productivity gains and declining national competitiveness in world markets have made academic research in enhancing technological innovation and business development. Even private institutions increasingly view their own viability and prestige as closely linked with their local economies...Businesses are responding to these changes, sponsoring research and relying on postsecondary institutions to meet training and management assistance needs. The historic dynamic relationships between academic and entrepreneurial "cultures" - with conflicting ideals, orientations, and goals - is giving way to a search for accommodation and collaboration."

Some examples of other partnerships are provided in Scholastic Interface: Educators' Guide to Corporate Support (1989). This is a two-volume set I strongly encourage community college leaders to review. The examples are as follows:

- Champion International give grants to elementary and to secondary public schools in local communities to develop new initiatives in science education.

- DuPont, GE, and Exxon, seek out talented minority and disadvantaged students for internships and scholarships in science and engineering careers.

- For more than 20 years, Westinghouse Electric has sponsored the "Annual Science Talent Search" which receives media coverage throughout the country.

- Campbell Soup's "Labels for Education" has for decades supplied many schools with equipment in exchange for labels collected from millions of households. Many packages goods companies have followed Campbell Soup's strategy.

- Companies that have both a national and regional presence-such as fast-food chains, retailers, banks, and utility companies-leave it to the local outlets to sponsor school events and programs. For example, only the local Apple dealer can allocate Apple's

resources to the local school in its area. Only the local McDonald's can donate food to a local school.

- American Honda's "Odyssey of the Mind" scholarships are awarded to teams of students who compete to solve practical problems such as how to transport a person around a pond for $5 or less.

- Apple Computer hired a group of top educators to advise school administrators and other high level decision-makers across the country on long range technology planning.

- AT&T will distribute its free curriculum module "Introduction to and History of Communication" to any school that wants to introduce students to technologies such as lasers, fiber-optics and bionics.

- Binney & Smith has been conducting art contests and awarding scholarships. In cooperation with the National Art Education Association, Binney & Smith is providing "Crayola Dream Makers" teaching modules.

- Colgate's "Battle of the Bands" and "Superstar Magic Club" classroom kits help teachers motivate students to practice good oral care habits.

- Faced with a shortage of teenage labor, Burger King is attracting employees with a scholarship program. Employees can earn up to $2,000 for college or vocational educational expenses. Some crew members, their children and grandchildren are eligible for $1,000 scholarships for post-secondary education expenses.

- Utility companies offer a variety of resource materials on energy conservation.

- Financial services companies support a two-year high school program. "The Academy of Finance." It integrates economics and finance curriculum with internships.

- More than 200 Bank of Boston employees volunteer in schools. They participate in reading programs in area schools, construct

classroom teaching aids, assist with production of yearbooks and newsletters, offer math and computer tutoring, help with marching bands, and serve as mentors to high school students.

- Boeing is a co-founder and supporter of Technology in Education (TIE). This group brings together people from business, industry, public school districts, and higher education. The program allows educators to attend business and industry-sponsored conferences, jointly planned short courses, workshop, seminars, and credit course offerings through Seattle Pacific University. Boeing also allows teachers to attend Boeing off-hour training courses at no cost.

Section III. Prototype Initiatives for Program Deliveries Based on K-12 - College/University Collaboration

In preparation for the challenges, complexities, but uncertainties of the 21st century, systemic restructuring of educational leadership will become increasingly imperative for all sectors. However, the following programmatic deliveries and prototype initiatives, as well as many others, could be established through restructured intersegmental collaboration between colleges and schools (based on the Pueblo/University of Southern Colorado model):

Faculty - Centered Initiatives

Science - Mathematics - Technology Articulation: The development of a collaborative team of science educators from K-12, and higher education could focus on enhancing science curriculum at all levels. The goal should be to clarify the content and expectation of science instruction, using the resources of both K-12 and higher education. This could facilitate increased participation of women and minorities in science, math and technology.

Faculty Exchange Program: The goal of this initiative could be to explore innovative ways to involve K-12, and higher education faculty in teaching "critical thinking" across all levels of teaching at the elementary and secondary levels. Resources could be consolidated to establish a "teacher development" center, serving as a resource for staff development activities. Here joint faculty could initiate dialogue, and complete training, for curriculum transformation.

Student - Faculty Research Initiative: This initiative could target educational research efforts that would involve K-12, students, with the aim being to increase skills, interests, and attitudes toward the discovery and application of knowledge. Here dialogue could focus on developing balanced cognitive skills relative to equity.

School-College Bound Articulation Agreement: This agreement could be developed by both institutional staffs representing the curriculum and instruction areas, and aimed at promulgating course sequences for college admission and/or early enrollment in higher education. This could be initiated to recruit, retain and graduate minorities and women in underrepresented academic areas of study.

Graduate Education/Leadership Development: This desperately needed initiative would provide in-district graduate education for teaching and administrative personnel whose aspirations are aimed at advanced professional training and leadership development for learning more about culturally diverse student populations and challenges.

Student - Centered Initiatives

Educational Leadership Mentoring Initiative: Academically qualified college students could be matched with at-risk youth (male & female) according to interests, backgrounds profiles, and other educational factors for the purpose of leadership mentoring.

College Student Volunteers in the K-12 Classroom: This effort could bring qualified volunteer aides (such as teacher education or other discipline students) into the urban classroom to work with students and teachers at designated grade levels. Here minorities and women could serve as role models.

High School Seniors-College Sophomore Program: This joint-initiative effort between K-12 and higher education could target a designated number of courses at the high school level and establish dual credit, as well as dual faculty status, for a curriculum bridge between the two sectors.

Leadership Institute for Elementary School Students: This initiative could involve the development of an intensive leadership institute, on the college campus for carefully selected elementary school students for the purpose of providing growth, development, skills analysis, and learning diagnosis toward enhanced leadership potential.

Business & Technology-Based Initiatives

Telecommunications Technology Initiative: Higher education and K-12 personnel could collaborate on resourceful initiatives which expand the use of instructional television, interactive video, and other forms of educational technology. Some extent could evolve around the establishment of targeted "distant learning" initiatives with the use of cable networking and video recorders.

Shared Library Resource Collaborative: This initiative could be extended between the two sectors to result in information resource sharing and better utilization of information networking throughout the joint educational communities. Here is an opportunity to utilize the available multicultural libraries to aid teachers with diversity-centered teaching.

Shared Business Services Collaborative: This initiative is particularly imperative as both sectors prepare for an era of "doing more with less". Fiscal and business officers from K-12, the county, and higher education could develop collaborative efforts to increase effectiveness and efficiency in delivering administrative support services to the educational process.

Community-Based Revitalization Initiative: This initiative could include development of shared leadership development programs and research efforts, to measure and assess institutional needs and community service effectiveness for high-risk youth--particularly minorities and women. (University of Southern Colorado, 1989)

Systemic Planning & Autonomy

Both institutions must reach consensus and mutual agreement of long range educational objectives, outcomes assessment and distribution of human, fiscal, technological and facility resources.

Respecting the traditional culture and autonomy of each educational institution, this restructured administration could achieve the following objectives (a) improve the academic and career accomplishments of the students in the school district; (b) strengthen the educational experiences of students at the college; (c) achieve cost savings in the district and the college, which then can be reallocated to educational quality initiatives; (d) enhance faculty development & alliance between the two sectors; (e) establish new organizational restructure; and (f) build on educational interdependence within the continuum and academic pipeline (University of Southern Colorado, 1989).

Section VI. Visionary Paradigm Shifts for Systemic Leadership

Gomez (1990) in To Advance Learning, with several of his other colleagues outlined very key elements for systemic leadership between sectors. He suggests that there must be "cooperation and collaboration; equity in interinstitutional relationships; shared goals, specific objectives and strategies for advanced learning; core administration team and identifcation of fiscal resources; student academic reinforcement programming; meaningful involvement of constituency groups and participants and; internal and external evaluation." These elements were reinforced earlier during the 1980s by Hodginson (1983) in All One System. In Management in Transition, Phillip Harris (1985) also nearly a decade ago identified perhaps the compelling paradigm shifts for contemporary leadership. They are as follows:

Transitional Management Paradigms

FROM	TO
RIGID, CLOSED-MINDED	FLEXIBLE, OPEN-MINDED
PAST-ORIENTED	FUTURE-ORIENTED
SHORT-TERM	LONG-TERM
QUANTITY-ORIENTED	QUALITY-ORIENTED
HIERARCHICAL	TEAM-ORIENTED
COMPETITIVE-COMBATIVE	COOPERATIVE-COLLABORATIVE
COMPLACENCY-ORIENTED	INITIATIVE-ORIENTED
PRAGMATIC/MECHANISTIC	CONCEPTUALIZES/SYNTHESIZE
ENVIRONMENTALLY AMORAL	ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE
AVERAGE PERFORMANCE	COMPETENT/HIGH PERFORMANCE
RESPOND TO CHANGE (See Kotter (1990) in A Force for Change	CREATE CHANGE (See Kotter (1990) in A Force for Change

In summation, I ask the following question: I wonder how well prepared educators, environmentalists and economists would be for the 21st century if systemic leadership was initiated during the Featherstone assessment (opening quote) in the late 1960's? Where would we be now in 1993 as we struggle with accelerated change, advanced technology and cultural pluralism? The above hopefully provides the passage, parameters and premises for collaborating with partnerships toward the educational, economic and environmental advancement on behalf of all Americans.

Thanks again for inviting me to participate in this important and timely "Leadership 2000" conference. Best wishes for a productive dialogue, as each of you struggle with developing ways to enact strategic visions for educational enterprises in the 21st century.

* Citations to references are subsumed in the manuscript.

Bio
Joseph M. Stevenson

Joseph Martin Stevenson, the only educator in the U.S. to join Fortune 500-type executives for a prestigious "Leadership Institute" in Colorado, has served as a management consultant in 25 states. He is an author, researcher, teacher, futurist, lecturer, consultant and innovative leader. He specializes in leadership development, organizational planning, work force diversity and "modern matrix management," a simple process he encourages for building connection, coherence, collaboration, and cohesion within a public or private organization.

After 15 years in higher education management in California, Tennessee, Oregon, and New Jersey, Dr. Stevenson experimented with a timely transition from higher education to the Pre K-12 sector in response to the escalating crisis affecting high-risk youth in the United States. Dr. Stevenson is currently the Acting Superintendent of Pleasantville Public Schools in New Jersey, an urban district between Philadelphia and Atlantic City. In this position, he oversees district-wide administration; personnel instruction; curriculum; staff development; budgeting; planning; program evaluation; special services; community education; grants; guidance and alternative education.

Prior to participating in executive and graduate education studies at Harvard and Vanderbilt Universities, Dr. Stevenson completed his undergraduate studies at California State University in Sacramento, and his graduate degrees at the University of Oregon in Eugene. He has participated in leadership institutes designed for senior administrators at Stanford, George Washington and Carnegie Mellon Universities.

Disk: Testimony
File Name:Sysl2000.conf